REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 11 are independent. Claims 6-8, 10 and 12-20 are withdrawn from consideration. In light of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to more appropriately recite the claimed invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner objected to the specification, rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §101; rejected claims 1, 3, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brooks (USP 7,143,432); and rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Yomdin (U.S. Patent Application No. 2005/0063596). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for the Interview conducted on December 17, 2008. During the Interview, the parties discussed the claimed invention. The Examiner further clarified his position regarding the teachings of the cited art. The parties agreed the outstanding 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection is withdrawn. The parties further discussed potential amendments to the claims directed to the 35 U.S.C. §112 and cited art rejections. The claim amendments made herein are further to, and consistent with, the discussion between the parties during the Interview.

CMV/ta

Objection to Specification

During the Interview, the parties discussed the "computer-readable medium" as recited in claim 11. The parties further agreed that one skilled in the art would appreciate the computer readable medium, storing the program, executed by a processor, to perform the method at the server may be embodied in the server. The computer-readable medium does not encompass non-statutory computer readable mediums such as a propagated signal.

As discussed during the Interview, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

As agreed upon during the Interview, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 9 and 11 asserting the claims are indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that, as recited in claims 1, 9 and 11, "sampling frames of a moving image" followed by "display of every frame" is contradictory.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that the multimedia format is an image in a format that enables interactive serial display of every sampled frame. Based on this amendment, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Brooks.

By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite a moving image conversion apparatus comprising sampling means for sampling frames from a moving image; and

CMV/ta

multimedia image generation means for **generating a multimedia image in a vector graphic animation based multimedia format** by compressing said sampled frames according to a compression method considering two-dimensional redundancy, **wherein each individual frame is compressed independently without reference to any other frame,** and wherein the multimedia image in the multimedia format is an image in a format that enables interactive serial display of every sampled frame.

In contrast, the disclosure of Brooks is directed to a system for transforming streaming video data. In col. 9, line 57 through col. 10, line 10 as follows:

> Further, control block 450 also receives information regarding what format the output stream of data should be encoded in, such as M-JPEG, GIF, MPEG format, H.263 format, Windows Media format, Quicktime format, Real Video format, or the like.

> The data associated with the output video data is typically derived from the requesting device. For example, in FIG. 1, the requesting device could be computer system 120 140, network appliance 180, or the like. In this embodiment, when the requesting device contacts gateway system 100 to request gateway system 100 send a video stream, the requesting device will also inform gateway system 100 as to the bandwidth requirements. For example, such requirements may include maximum frame rate, color-depth, screen resolution or spatial bandwidth, maximum bit rate, and the like. Further, the requesting device will also inform gateway system 100 which output video format should be used to encode the data. For example, JPEG, JPEG-2000, GIF, WBMP, MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, *.avi, *.mov, *rm, *.aff, and the like.

However, as agreed during the Interview, Brooks fails to teach or suggest multimedia image generation means for **generating a multimedia image in a vector graphic animation based multimedia format** by compressing said sampled frames according to a compression method considering two-dimensional redundancy, **wherein each individual frame is compressed independently without reference to any other frame,** and wherein the multimedia image in the multimedia format is an image in a format that enables interactive serial display of every sampled frame. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

CMV/ta

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 11 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet Reg. No. 52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 21, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Catherine M. Voisinet
Registration No.: 52,327
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

CMV/ta